

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application in light of the present amendment and remarks is respectfully requested.

FIG. 2 has been corrected as there is an error in the lettering of the second item 204 in Fig. 2. A replacement sheet is attached.

Claims 1-27 have been rejected.

Claims 28-29 were previously canceled.

Claims 1-6, 8-10, 12, 15, 16, 18 and 26-27 have been amended.

Claims 1-27 are pending in this application.

35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Craig et al (US Publ. 2004/0203806, hereinafter “Craig”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been rearranged and amended to incorporate portions of claims 4, 5 and 8, and to clarify that an interferer identified in a first unit causes that first unit to send an agent to the interferer, wherein the interferer activates that agent to mitigate interference it is causing. Further support for this can be found in the specification on page 12 lines 20-23, page 13 lines 5-31, and page 14 lines 1-13 and 25-26.

Applicants respectfully submit that Craig does not recite the transfer of an interference mitigating agent between communication units. And in particular, Craig does not recite the transfer of an interference mitigating agent from an interfered unit to an interfering unit, wherein the agent then controls the communication behavior of the interfering unit. Also, Craig does not disclose the propagation of such agent among units (claim 4) between different communication networks (claim 5).

Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 is patentably distinct and non-obvious over the cited art, and is now deemed allowable.

Claim 2 has been recast to reflect that the agent is activated in the interferer by a trigger. Support for this can be found in the specification on page 9 lines 23-25, page 10 lines 1-6, and page 17 lines 27-30.

Claim 3 has been amended to incorporate portions of claim 2.

Claim 4 has been recast to reflect that the resource-responsible agent is propagated from among interfering communication unit, thereby increasing network performance with no centralized control. Support for this can be found in the specification on page 16 lines 14-15.

Claim 5 has been recast to reflect that propagation of the agent occurs between different networks, thereby providing improved inter-network performance. Support for this can be found in the specification on page 24 lines 29-30.

Claim 8 has been recast to reflect that the agent is activated in accordance with different sensitivity thresholds. Support for this can be found in the specification on page 15 lines 2-18.

Claim 9 has been recast to reflect that the agent is activated in accordance with different sensitivity thresholds. Support for this can be found in the specification on page 15 line 20 to page 16 line 11.

Moreover, claims 2-9 and 21-24 are dependent upon amended claim 1, and are therefore deemed allowable as well in view of said dependency.

Independent claims 10 and 26 have been amended to include the recitations of amended claim 1, hereby incorporated by reference, and are therefore deemed novel and inventive as well.

Claims 11-20, 25 and 27 are dependent upon amended claims 10 and 26, respectively, and are therefore deemed allowable as well in view of said dependency.

Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection has been overcome.

The other references of record have been reviewed and applicant's invention is deemed patentably distinct and nonobvious over each taken alone or in combination.

For the foregoing reasons, applicants respectfully request that the above rejections be withdrawn.

Inasmuch as this amendment distinguishes all of the applicants' claims over the prior art references, for the many reasons indicated above, passing of this case is now believed to be in order. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

Authorization is hereby given to charge any fees necessitated by actions taken herein to Deposit Account 50-2117.

Customer Number 22917

Motorola, Inc.
Law Dept. - 3rd floor
1303 E. Algonquin Rd.
Schaumburg, IL 60196

Respectfully submitted,
Howard Thomas

By: /Brian Mancini/
Brian M. Mancini
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 39,288
Phone: (847) 576-3992
FAX: (847) 576-3750